

REMARKS


Claims 10-14 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. In response, claim 10 is canceled. The independent claim 1 is added with the limitations of canceled claim 10 for allowance, and claims 8 and 11 have been amended, accordingly. Furthermore, applicant respectively points out that the examiner's reference to **Siegel [US 6,958,707]** be reconsidered on the basis that **Siegel et al** only transmits alert signals 104 in a full 360 degree circle and not in a "transmitting and receiving" fashion as examiner mentions in Office Action dated 09/05/2007 (page 4). Applicant respectively submits that transmitting RFID technologies are common to radiate 360 degrees. However, the reception pattern of said transmissions for the applicant are the distinguishing factor as stated in claim 1, which in part reads "to receive information, from 360 degrees".

Claims 16-18 are allowable over the prior arts.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the phone discussion on September 11th, 2007 and has made the discussed amendments to the claims. No new matter has been entered.

Sincerely,

Gregory S. Eskridge

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gregory S. Eskridge', written over the printed name.

Applicant

Michael L. Greenberg, Esq

Reg. No. 47312



I hereby certify that this amendment and response was submitted to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on September 20, 2007.

Sincerely,

Gregory S. Eskridge


Applicant

Michael L. Greenberg, Esq.

Reg. No. 47312